

Terminological Classification of Names of Work Tools: A Comparative Study of English and Uzbek Languages

Fazliddinov Khurshid

Independent researcher of Samarkand State Institute of Foreign languages

Abstract. *The evolution of work tools reflects human ingenuity and cultural diversity, and their names are a rich source of linguistic and cultural insights. This paper examines the terminological classification of work tool names in English and Uzbek, highlighting their linguistic structures, semantic features, and cultural contexts. By analyzing examples from both languages, the study identifies functional, material-based, and cultural-historical classifications. Additionally, it explores the role of loanwords, metaphorical usage, and idiomatic expressions in shaping these terms. The findings underscore the interplay between language, technology, and culture, offering insights valuable for linguistics, translation, and cross-cultural studies.*

Key words: *work tools, terminology, English, Uzbek, functional classification, cultural linguistics, metaphorical expressions.*

Introduction. The names of work tools, while seemingly mundane, are deeply rooted in the history and culture of human societies. They reflect not only the technological advancements of a community but also its cultural values, practices, and linguistic creativity. In English and Uzbek, the terminology of work tools has evolved alongside changes in labor, agriculture, and industry, serving as a linguistic repository of human experience. This study aims to explore the terminological classification of work tool names in English and Uzbek, focusing on three main research questions:

1. What are the major categories of work tool names in English and Uzbek?
2. How do linguistic features of these terms reflect cultural and historical contexts?
3. What similarities and differences exist between the two languages in terms of terminological patterns?

By examining these questions, the study seeks to deepen our understanding of the cultural and linguistic dimensions of work tool terminology.

Methods. Data Collection

A corpus of 300 terms for work tools was compiled from a range of sources:

- **English Sources:** Dictionaries, technical manuals, historical texts, and online databases.
- **Uzbek Sources:** Monolingual and bilingual dictionaries, agricultural and industrial texts, and oral interviews with native speakers.

Examples of collected terms include:

- English: *hammer, spade, wrench, chisel*
- Uzbek: *bolg'a, belkurak, kalit, kesgi*

Classification Framework

The collected terms were analyzed using a classification framework with three main categories:

1. **Functional Classification:** Based on the primary purpose of the tool (e.g., cutting, striking, digging).
2. **Material-Based Classification:** Reflecting the material or components of the tool.
3. **Cultural-Historical Classification:** Highlighting terms with cultural or historical significance.

Analytical Approach

The analysis included:

1. **Semantic Analysis:** Examining the literal and figurative meanings of terms.
2. **Linguistic Features:** Identifying patterns in morphology, phonology, and syntax.
3. **Cultural Contextualization:** Investigating how historical and societal factors influenced terminology.

Results. 1. Functional Classification

Both English and Uzbek group work tools primarily by their function, demonstrating a shared focus on practicality:

Cutting Tools:

English: *knife, saw, chisel*

Uzbek: *pichoq, arra, kesgi*

Cutting tools in both languages are named for their sharp edges, with similar onomatopoeic elements (*arra* and *saw* mimic cutting sounds).

Digging Tools:

English: *spade, hoe, shovel*

Uzbek: *belkurak, ketmon, changak*

Uzbek terms like *ketmon* reflect Central Asian agricultural traditions, while English terms lean toward industrialized farming.

Striking Tools:

English: *hammer, mallet*

Uzbek: *bolg'a, qoshiqcha (small hammer)*

2. Material-Based Classification

Tools are often named for their material, especially in Uzbek, where traditional materials play a significant role:

English: *steel blade, wooden handle*

Uzbek: *temir tig' (iron blade), yog'och dastak (wooden handle)*

3. Cultural-Historical Classification

Uzbek terminology frequently references traditional tools used in agriculture and crafts, while English terms reflect industrial and colonial influences:

Uzbek: *Omoch* (traditional plow), *kesgi* (cutting tool used in leatherwork).

English: *Anvil* (industrial forging), *lathe* (machine tool).

4. *Loanwords and Influences*

English: Terms like *pliers* and *chisel* are borrowed from French and Latin, reflecting technological exchange.

Uzbek: Loanwords such as *plow* (from Russian) and *kalit* (from Persian) illustrate regional linguistic integration.

5. *Metaphorical and Idiomatic Usage*

Work tools in both languages are commonly used metaphorically, often symbolizing utility or labor:

English: “*A tool in the toolbox*” (indicating usefulness).

Uzbek: “*Kalitdek odam*” (A person as useful as a key).

Discussion. Universal Patterns.

Both English and Uzbek demonstrate a functional classification of tools, indicating the universal importance of practicality in terminology. Names like *hammer* and *bolg'a* reflect their role in human labor, transcending cultural boundaries.

Cultural Nuances

Uzbek terms often highlight the region's agrarian history, while English terms reflect industrialization. For instance, the prominence of *ketmon* in Uzbek discourse underscores the centrality of manual farming in Central Asian history.

Linguistic Dynamics

Loanwords enrich both languages, showing how linguistic exchange accompanies technological advancements. Uzbek's adoption of Russian terms during the Soviet era illustrates political and cultural influences, while English's absorption of Latin and French terms reflects its colonial and industrial past.

Implications for Translation and Linguistics

The differences in metaphorical usage and cultural context pose challenges for translators. For example, translating *ketmon* as *hoe* may fail to convey the tool's cultural significance in Uzbek.

Conclusion. The terminological classification of work tool names in English and Uzbek reveals a fascinating interplay of language, culture, and history. While functional classifications show universal patterns, cultural and historical contexts significantly shape terminology. Future research could expand this study to include other languages, examining how globalization influences the evolution of work tool terminology.

List of References

1. Crystal, D. (2003). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*. Cambridge University Press.
2. Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. Prentice Hall.
3. Sharipov, K. (2018). *Qishloq xo'jalik texnologiyalari tarixi*. Tashkent: Universitet Nashriyoti.
4. Norman, E. (2015). *Tools: A Cultural History*. Oxford University Press.
5. Usmonov, A. (2021). *O'zbek tili va madaniyatida terminlarning ahamiyati*. Tashkent Publishing.
6. Sapir, E. (1949). *Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech*. Harcourt Brace.
7. Online Uzbek-English Technical Dictionary (2022).